

5/5m

28 January 1958

Memorandum for the Record on Conference with [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Since Andie had told me that his standing requirements on Civil Defense as incorporated in the standing requirements of the Branch as of 1 July 1957 apparently had not been distributed abroad as assumed, I asked Bob where the Branch requirements had been disseminated. Since he said that he had never seen them, I showed them to him and read to him my memorandum of 19 September with which I had submitted them. He told me that he was out at that time and called in [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

I asked [REDACTED] the same question. His answer was that copies had been sent only to [REDACTED] and EE/DE (In charge of defector interrogation). He had regarded our requirements as requirements for clandestine collection and as such he believed they were not drafted in the proper manner. I told him that I had expected St/I/R to disseminate them at all places in Washington and abroad from which information could be reasonably expected. [REDACTED] could be of only limited help in an informal way and EE/DE covered only defectors. Apart from that, if the format did not appear appropriate for the intended purpose, I should have been informed of it immediately. If this had been done, I would have tailored the requirements to their needs. I have now lost about 4 months -- a fact which is particularly unfortunate with regard to Civil Defense. [REDACTED] agreed with me and apologized.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Stating that there is no sense in crying about spilled milk, I requested Bob and Jack to let me know their criticism and to instruct me as to how, in their opinion, the standing requirements should be set up. The lengthy discussion of these subjects resulted in the following suggestions by Bob:

1. A separate requirement should be made up for each subject and on each country. It should contain a description of the background as introduction. This introductory statement should, among other things, spell out what we already know. The questions asked should be much more specific. Our CEMA requirements are a good example. In addition, Jack gave me a copy of the Intelligence Collection Guide for Nonferrous Metals and Minerals in Czechoslovakia as another pattern.

2. The requirements need a different format for (a) clandestine collection, which includes defector interrogation and (b) for overt collection, e.g., STATE. They are willing to rewrite our requirements correspondingly, so that one set would be enough for submission to them for both overt and clandestine. However, we should indicate by an asterisk which questions are proper for clandestine collection only.

3. Our questions should be tailored primarily to eliminate important gaps in our state of intelligence rather than express all our interests.

4. In addition to these requirements for St/I/R, we should continue to submit to other places our standing reading requirements in the old form.

5. We should not submit all our requirements at the same time but space submissions so that they are distributed over the year. With this qualification, we should revise requirements, at least, every 9 months.

6. No new requirements are required for CEMA. Civil Defense is being worked on anyway.

I told Bob that, if we followed these rules, we would, in view of our various interests and the existing manpower scarcity, not have sufficient time left for research and report writing. I added that, at present, it will probably be impossible to do anything about the matter and that, in the future, I will probably have to cut down standing requirements to a bare minimum.

Andie stayed on to discuss his Civil Defense problem. We were assured that all his recent requirements had been sent everywhere with high priority.

25X1A9a